REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Prior to entry of this Amendment, the application included claims 1-18, 20-28, 30-36, 39-44, 48 and 49. No claims have been amended, added or canceled. Hence, claims 1-18, 20-28, 30-36, 39-44, 48 and 49 stand pending for examination. Reconsideration is requested.

Claims 1-18, 20-28, 30-36, 39-44, 48 and 49 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated over the cited portions of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0036922 to Fries ("Fries").

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of all pending claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) since the reference of record does not teach each and every claim element, either expressly or inherently, as required for a proper rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Specifically, for example, Fries does not teach or suggest "wherein receiving property record data for a plurality of parcels into a computer system comprises: receiving a plurality of images representing the property record documents; converting the images to electronic image data; paginating the electronic image data into related groups representing individual documents; identifying a document type for each individual document; identifying data fields on each individual document; using a combination of computer-implemented processes and manual processes to convert information in the data fields into electronic information; and organizing the electronic information into property record data." The Office Action cites ¶¶[0043]-[0044] for this teaching. At this location, however, Fries appears merely to teach the processor and I/O portions of a typical computer. At this location, Fries does not teach anything having to do with receiving property record according to the specific steps claimed by the Applicants. Moreover, Fries does not teach such limitations anywhere else. Hence, claim 1 is believed to be allowable, at least for this reason.

Claim 25 includes similar elements and is believed to be allowable for similar reasons. Claims 2-18 and 20-24, which depend from claim 1, and claims 26-28, which depend from claim 25, are believed to be allowable for the reasons stated above.

Claim 30 recites "using the identifier to search the database and select from the property record documents a set of relevant documents relating to the parcel; . . . using the set of relevant documents to produce a data summary." Fries does not teach this. Fries' title examination system does not identify relevant documents and use the set of relevant documents to produce a data summary. Hence, claim 30 is believed to be allowable, at least for this reason.

Moreover, Fries does not teach scoring relevant documents based on their degree of relevance as recited in claims 34 and 42. The paragraphs in Fries cited by the Office Action as teaching a document scoring system (¶¶ [0037]-[0038]) appear to relate to a parcel scoring system and have nothing to do with a system for scoring the relevance of documents. Hence, for at least the foregoing reasons, claims 34 and 42 are believed to be allowable over the cited reference.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, the Applicants believe all claims now pending in this application are in condition for allowance and an action to that end is respectfully requested.

            If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-571-4000.

            Respectfully submitted,

Date: <u>June 18, 2007</u>   <u>/Irvin E. Branch/</u>
            Irvin E. Branch
            Reg. No. 42,358

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111-3834
Tel: 303-571-4000
Fax: 415-576-0300
IEB/jln
61045689 v1